United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,973	04/01/2004	Kevin Duesman	501184.02	1677
7590 08/02/2007 Steven H. Arterberry, Esq. DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP			EXAMINER NGUYEN, HUNG	
Suite 3400 1420 Fifth Ave		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Scattle, WA 98	101		2851	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

• •					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
<u> </u>	· 10/816,973	DUESMAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hung Henry V. Nguyen	2851			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Ap	oril 2004.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 30-39 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 30 and 32-39 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 31 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/7/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/816,973 Page 2

Art Unit: 2851

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show "reticles 118 and 119" (see page 5, line 46) as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2851

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claim 30, 32-38 are rejected under McCullough et al (U.S.Pat. 6,628,372).

With respect to claim 30, McCullough et al disclose a photolithographic assembly comprising all of the limitations of the instant claim such as: a light source (12); a support (16) adapted to support the photoreactive layer proximate the light source; a first photolithographic mask (22) positioned between the light source and the support, the first photolithographic mask having a patterning portion for patterning a first portion of the photoreactive layer; and a second photolithographic mask (24) positioned between the light source and the support, the second photolithographic mask having a patterning portion for patterning a second portion of the photoreactive layer.

As to claim 32, it is disclosed that the second photolithographic mask (24) is positioned in alignment with the first photolithographic mask (22).

Application/Control Number: 10/816,973

Art Unit: 2851

As to claim 33, McCullough et al disclose a robotic handler (14, 32) for positioning the first and second photolithographic masks (22, 24) between the light source (12) and the support (16).

With respect to claims 34-35, McCullough et al disclose the first mask and the second mask have blocking portions/peripheral portions for preventing exposure of the second portion/reexposure portion of the photoreactive layer.

As to claims 36 and 37, although, McCullough et al do not expressly disclose the memory element portion and the periphery portion of the first and second patterning portion. These elements are seen to be inherent teachings of the patterning portions and they must be present for first and second masks of McCullough to function as intended.

As to claim 38, McCullough et al disclose a lens (18) positioned between the light source (12) and the support (16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCullough et al (U.S.Pat. 6,628,372) in view of Fujimoto (U.S.Pat. 6,522,389).

As to claim 39, McCullough et al disclose a photolithographic assembly comprising substantially all of the limitations of the instant claim including an exposure parameter modifier

Application/Control Number: 10/816,973 Page 5

Art Unit: 2851

(13) positioned between the light source (12) and the support (16) for modifying the exposure if needed (see col.2, lines 49-51). McCullough et al do not expressly disclose the modifier being a condenser. Fujimoto discloses a lithographic assembly having a condenser (103) positioned between the light source (101) and the support (108). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the exposure modifier (13) of McCullough by the condenser (103) as taught by Fujimoto to generate a parallel beam. The purpose of doing so would have been to obtain an uniform exposure intensity and whereby the quality of the images is greatly improved.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claim 31 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record either alone or in combination, neither discloses nor makes obvious the combination of a photolithographic assembly comprising a light source, a support, a first mask, a second mask, wherein at least part of the second photolithographic mask is positioned between the first photolithographic mask and the support, as recited in the instant claim of the present application.

Prior Art Made of Record

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2851

Isohata et al (U.S.Pat. 4,878,086) and Pierrat (U.S.Pat. 6,040,892) disclose lithographic devices and have been cited for technical background.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Henry V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (First Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diane Lee can be reached on 571-272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Hung Henry V Nguyen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2851